Mr. C. ABDUL JABBAR said that in the case of *mafi* licences, there was nothing like a penalty even for extension of time.

Mr. Tudki RAMANNA GOWDA urged that even in respect of licences obtained on payment, no penalty should be levied because in many cases, due to unforeseen circumstances, it might not be possible to remove the fuel within the time prescribed.

Najm ut-ujjar HAJI MAHOMED MUSTAPHA SAHIB said that the system of issuing licences was a wholesome one. If that system was relaxed as suggested, he feared that the forests would soon disappear He was himself a contractor dealing in gall-nut and tangadi bark and his experience was that the system of issuing licences had saved the forests to a great extent. He therefore insisted that licences should be issued only by the Amildars and not by patels or anybody else.

Mr. K. VENKATARAMIAH said he would have no objection to the suggestion, but was particular that the time-limit now fixed, quite insufficient, should be extended.

Mr. C. ABDUL JABBAR said that he would issue instructions to the departmental officers to see that all reasonable facilities were given in the matter of removal of firewood.

The House rose at 5 p.m. for the day to meet again at 12 of the clock the following day.

SIXTH DAY.

Saturday, 21st October 1939.

The House reassembled at the Jagan Mohan Palace Pavilion on Saturday, 21st October 1939, at 12 of the clock, Mr. President (*Amin-ul-Mulk* Sir Mirza M. Ismail, K.C.I.E., O.B.E., Dewan) in the Chair.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS—*contd.*

Remissions under Kodihalli Tank.

Q.—50. **Mr. D. SIVASANKARIAH** (Chellakere Taluk).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that Kodihalli tank is being supplied with water from Lakalgere channel;

(*b*) whether it has come to their notice that the Kodihalli tank is not receiving sufficient water year by year;

(*c*) whether any order has been passed by Government at any time before, that only half the assessment should be recovered on lands under the tank if it did not receive more than half the quantity of water before the 15th of November every year and if no wet crops were raised on the lands;

(*d*) when was such order passed;

(*e*) for how many years has assessment been so recovered;

(*f*) from what years has full assessment been recovered and for what reasons;

(*g*) the number of petitions that were presented by the raiyats under the Kodihalli tank in the matter of remission of assessment on lands under this tank and on what dates;

(*h*) how these petitions were disposed of by Government?

A.—**The CHIEF SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT (Rajasevaprasaktha B. T. Kesavalengar).**—

(*a*) Yes.

(*b*) This tank received full supply of water in some years and less than half in other years when the question of remission was duly considered on merits.

(*c*) Yes.

(*d*) In the year 1911.

(*e*) From references available, it is seen that assessment was remitted up to the end of 1929-30 when the tank did not receive half of its full supply of water till 15th November of the respective years.

(*f*) From 1930-31 onwards, no remission was given in any year on account of more than half the wet *atchkat* being under cultivation and having also yielded a crop of eight annas.

(*g*) It is reported that petitions were presented every year during the Dittam and Huzur Jamabandies for remission of wet assessment. During 1938-39, a petition is said to have been presented on 18th January 1939. The dates on which petitions were presented in other years are stated to be not readily traceable.

(*h*) These petitions were disposed of by issue of endorsements to the effect that no remission of assessment could be granted as more than half the extent of *atchkat* was under cultivation and the out-turn of crop was not less than four annas.

Mr. T. SHADAKSHARAPPA.—Is it not a fact that the tank has not been receiving sufficient water for many years now?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—In years full supply of water had not been received and the crop raised fell below 4 annas, remission would have been given. Without reference to remission figures, we cannot say whether a tank received full supply or not in a particular year or series of years. That is why particulars of the remissions granted have been furnished in the answer.

Mr. T. SHADAKSHARAPPA.—Is there any scheme for diverting water from Garanihalla channel to this tank?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—No. In 1911, the raiyats petitioned Government and an order was passed to the effect that remission should be given whenever the tank did not receive half of its full supply of water. In 1925, representations were again made and Government reconsidered the question. The Engineering Department had reported that the feeder channel had been repaired and if there was good rainfall, the tank would get sufficient supply and the crops would not suffer.

Mr. T. SHADAKSHARAPPA.—Has it come to notice that the feeder channel has not helped to bring in any supply to the tank?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGADR.—In whichever year the supply was inadequate and there was failure of crops, remission has been given.

Mr. J. S. MAHALINGAPPA.—Who sends up the remission statements to Government?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—The Deputy Commissioner.

Mr. J. S. MAHALINGAPPA.—Does the Deputy Commissioner report to Government which are all the tanks that have not received full supplies?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—Yes.

Mr. J. S. MAHALINGAPPA.—In how many years have the supplies been less than half?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—I cannot readily answer such a general question.

Mr. T. SHADAKSHARAPPA.—Has it come to the notice of Government that the feeder channel is not in order?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—No, but we shall enquire.

Mr. T. SHADAKSHARAPPA.—Have not the local raiyats requested that they should be entrusted with the repair of the feeder channel on a contract basis?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—I do not know.

Mr. T. SHADAKSHARAPPA.—Has it come to your notice that outside contractors do not execute such works satisfactorily and if so, will opportunities be given to local raiyats to undertake the contracts?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—Most willingly.

Mr. T. SHADAKSHARAPPA.—But our application in that respect has not been considered at all.

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—If any such application is pending disposal, it will be considered favourably.

Mr. D. SIVASANKARIAH.—With reference to answer (*f*), is it not a fact that even though the tank failed to receive full supply in 1930-31, no remissions were given?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—If no remission was given, it means probably that the supply was adequate. It is only when the crop raised is less than 4 annas that we can say that the tank has not received full supply.

Mr. D. SIVASANKARIAH.—What is the agency for ascertaining and recording figures regarding the crop realised?

Mr. B T. KESAVAIENGAR.—The Amildar inspects the tanks in November every year and sends up his report, and the Sub-Division Officer verifies whether the report represents the facts correctly or not.

Yajaman N. Y. VEERABHADRACHAR.—Even when the tank receives full supply, full crop cannot be raised on all the lands forming the *atchkat*. There are any number of cases like that, particularly at the tail-end of the *atchkat*. What is the relief given in such cases?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—Even in such cases, remedy has been provided for. But the subject here relates only to one specific case, *viz.*, Kodihalli tank.

Mr. T. SHADAKSHARAPPA.—Subsequent to 1930–31, full crop has not been raised but full assessment is being collected. In such cases, will any portion of the amount collected be refunded?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—We shall make enquiries if there are any such cases and consider if refunds are called for in any of them according to rules.

Mr. D. SIVASANKARIAH.—Has the feeder channel been repaired?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—The report of the Chief Engineer says that in 1925 the feeder channel of the Kodihalli tank was thoroughly repaired and that if only the monsoons prove good, the tank will receive full supply.

Mr. D. SIVASANKARIAH.—There are three other tanks on the way which fill first, and this particular tank fills only if there is a surplus supply. That is why it is absolutely necessary to divert the Garanihalla channel to this tank.

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—It has been decided that the diversion is not feasible.

The FIRST MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina N. Madhava Rau).—Is not water received through the existing feeder channel?

Mr. D. SIVASANKARIAH.—It is all silted up and the supply received now is very scanty.

Mr. S. RAMAPPA.—Are Government aware that because of lack of sympathy on the part of the local officers, remissions are not being recommended?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—I cannot accept that statement.

Mr. S. RAMAPPA.—Will the Deputy Commissioner be requested to make special enquiries in regard to that particular tank and make a report whether or not remissions are called for?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—Yes.

Mr. GURUBASAPPA.—Do the rules prescribe any time-limit within which applications for remission of assessment in any year should reach Government?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—Even that rule has been relaxed recently. The Amildar himself can recommend remission in deserving cases without waiting for applications at all. There is a circular issued to that effect.

Water-supply to Hiriyur Town.

Q.—51. **Messrs. B. SITARAMIAH and MAHOMED PACHA SAHEB** (Hiriyur Taluk).—

Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(*a*) whether a Jewell Filter has been constructed recently for the supply of drinking water to Hiriyur Town;

(*b*) the amount of expenditure incurred for this purpose;

(*c*) the number of gallons of water that was being supplied every day before the construction of this Jewell Filter;

(*d*) the number of gallons of water that is now supplied every day;

(*e*) the population of Hiriyur Town;

(*f*) the annual expenditure incurred before;

(*g*) the expenditure now incurred;

(*h*) whether it has come to their notice that there has been an everyday complant from the people of Hiriyur Town, who are going from street to